



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/098,513 04/17/98 INGLE

7 15102100

000014 PWB2/0407  
FITZPATRICK WILLIAM HARRIS & SCINTO  
80 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK NY 10112

EXAMINER

BORSLY, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

8685

DATE MAILED:

04/07/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/096,515**

Applicant(s)  
**Yuji Inoue et al.**

Examiner  
**Dennis L. Dorsey**

Group Art Unit  
**3635**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 15, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 2 and 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, and 6-13 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3635

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori in view of Hayami.

Mori teaches all the limitations in the above claims except the composition of the jacket of the connector and electrical lead. Mori teaches solar cell modules (40) fixed to a resin substrate (column 2, lines 27-30), and electrically connected by connector (42), cable (43) and junction box (44). Hayami teaches lead wire surrounded by a jacket composed of polyethylene resin. It would be obvious to select such a material that is well known in the art. One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would select this composition to provide superior protection of the electrical lead.

Art Unit: 3635

3. Claims 4 and 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoyama et al. in view Hayami.

Itoyama et al. teaches all the limitations of the above claims except the composition of the jacket of the connector and electrical lead and method. Itoyama teaches solar cell (101), metal substrate (107), backing material (104), electrically connected (113), spacers (102), power converter (column 3, lines 12-15), and air flow apparatus (see figure 8).

Hayami teaches lead wire surrounded by a jacket made composed of polyethylene resin. It would be obvious to select such a material that is well known in the art. One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would select this composition to provide superior protection of the electrical lead.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 15, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the above references do not teach that the substrate is made of metal. The limitation as set forth by the Applicant is that the substrate is made from at least one selected from the group consisting of metal, resins, and glass. Mori clearly teaches that solar modules is sealed with resin (column 2, lines 27-30) now made clear and set forth in the rejection. Itoyama et al. teaches that the substrate or plate (107) is made of metal (column 9, lines 11-13).

Art Unit: 3635

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L. Dorsey whose telephone number is (703) 306-9137.

DLD 

March 30, 2000

  
Carl O. Friedman  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3600